

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 ANDREW L. MEEKS, II,

Case No. 3:18-cv-00431-MMD-WGC

7 Plaintiff,

ORDER

8 v.

9 ISIDRO BACCA, *et al.*,

10 Defendants.

11 *Pro se* Plaintiff Andrew L. Meeks, II brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
12 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of
13 United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 43), recommending the Court
14 grant in part, and deny in part, Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 26
15 (“Motion”). Defendants had until January 4, 2021 to file an objection.¹ To date, no
16 objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court
17 adopts the R&R, and will grant in part, and deny in part, Defendants’ Motion.

18 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
19 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party
20 fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to
21 conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas*
22 *v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
23 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and
24 recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the
25 findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory
26

27
28 ¹Defendants originally had until November 24, 2020 to file an objection. (ECF No. 43.) However, the Court granted (ECF No. 45) Defendants’ motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 44), making their objection due January 4, 2021 (ECF No. 45).

1 Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no
2 clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

3 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is
4 satisfied Judge Cobb did not clearly err. Here, Judge Cobb first recommends Defendants’
5 Motion be denied to the extent they argue Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative
6 remedies. (ECF No. 43 at 8-15). Judge Cobb next recommends Defendants’ Motion be
7 denied as to Plaintiff retaliation claim against Vest in Count I because material disputes
8 of fact preclude summary judgment. (*Id.* at 15-20.) Judge Cobb similarly recommends
9 that Plaintiff’s retaliation claims in Counts II-V be allowed to proceed. (*Id.* at 20-24.) Judge
10 Cobb then recommends Defendants’ Motion be denied as to Plaintiff’s excessive force
11 claim because a reasonable fact finder could believe Plaintiff’s version of events. (*Id.* at
12 24-30.) However, Judge Cobb recommends Defendants’ Motion be granted as to
13 Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference to serious medical needs claim
14 because the undisputed evidence shows he received adequate medical care. (*Id.* at 30-
15 32.) Similarly, because “Plaintiff received adequate notice of the charge against him, and
16 because there was some evidence to support the disciplinary finding, summary judgment
17 should be granted in favor of Henley and Baca on the due process claim.” (*Id.* at 32-37.)
18 That said, Judge Cobb also recommends the Court reject Defendants’ arguments based
19 on a purported lack of a private right of action, discretionary immunity, or qualified
20 immunity. (*Id.* at 37-42.) Finally, Judge Cobb recommends on one hand that Defendants
21 are entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff’s state law claims analogous to his Eighth
22 and Fourteenth Amendment claims because he recommends summary judgment be
23 granted on those federal claims, but on the other finds that Plaintiff’s claims allowed to
24 proceed may also proceed against the Nevada Department of Corrections (“NDOC”) and
25 the State of Nevada because he recommends that those claims proceed against
26 individual NDOC employees. The Court agrees with Judge Cobb’s thorough analysis.
27 Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt the R&R in full.
28

1 It is therefore ordered that Judge Cobb's Report and Recommendation (ECF No.
2 43) is accepted and adopted in full.

3 It is further ordered that Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 26)
4 is granted in part, and denied in part, as follows. It is granted as to the federal and state
5 deliberate indifference to serious medical needs claims against Vest in Count IV, and as
6 to the federal and state due process claims against Baca and Henley in Count V. It is
7 denied as to the state and federal retaliation claims in Counts I (Vest), II (Vest, Escamilla
8 and Cook), IV (Vest) and V (Vest), and as to the federal and state excessive force claims
9 against Vest, and the state assault and battery claims against Vest, the State of Nevada
10 and NDOC in Count III.

11 DATED THIS 6th Day of January 2021.

12
13 

14 MIRANDA M. DU
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28